



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,859	07/10/2001	David Agassy	01/21773	5989

7590 10/14/2005

G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD.
c/o ANTHONY CASTORINA
SUITE 207
2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/900,859

Applicant(s)

AGASSY ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,7,13-16,18,23,26-28,36,37,39,42-44 and 55-57 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-62 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. However, the none of the priority application contain the claimed subject matter, intercepting data communicated between a sender and a receiver, and conditionally altering that data, memory for storing predetermined device settings, replace unit, identification, packet based network, framework, content text, tag, SGML, a data carrier with general purpose computer, JavaScript, etc. Hence, the applicant does not benefit the effective dates of the provisional priority applications.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

The following title is suggested: "Dedicated proxy server to dynamically add information to the web server generated web pages based on client settings".

4. The abstract is objected to because it contains terms, "and the like", "such as", "may be", etc. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 13-16, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 36, 37, 39, 42-44 and 55-57 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 mentions, “,” after “said communication”, “settings”, “settings”, “intercepted communication”, which should be “;”.

Claim 2 mentions, “ ”, which should be “,”, after “identification”, “sender”, “the receiver”.

Claim 4 mentions, “of a”, which should be “of :”, after “consisting”.

Claim 7 mentions, “ ”, which should be “,”, after “network”, “transmission”.

Claim 13 mentions, “ ”, which should be “,”, after “text”.

Claims 14, 37, 55, mention, “ ”, which should be “,”, after “format”.

Claim 15 mentions, “that selection”, which should be “said selection”.

Claims 16, 26, 57, mention, “ ”, which should be “,”, after “Script”, “links”, etc, and, “that data”, should be “said data”.

Claims 18, 27, 28, mentions, “ ”, which should be “,”, after “data”.

Claims 23, 36 mentions, “ ”, which should be “,”, after “text”.

Claim 39 mentions, “apparatus of claim 15”, which should be “apparatus of claim 38”.

Claims 42, 43, 44 mention, “,” after “sent”, “settings”, “intercepted communication”, which should be “;”.

Claim 57 mentions, “claim 56wherein”, which should be “claim 56, wherein”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 2, 7, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23-26, 28, 29, 33, 36, 38-41, 44, 45, 54-57, 61, 62, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2, 7, 13, 15, 16, 17, 23-26, 36, 38-41, 45, 55-57, 61, 62, recite the limitations, “the group consisting of”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 10, 20, 33, recite the limitations, “the framework”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 18, 28, 62, recite the limitations, “the group consisting of”, “the resolution of the data”, “the compression of the data”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29, recites the limitations, “the computer”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 44, recites the limitations, “the intended receiver”, “the communication”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Since multiple communications exist in the claim, it is not clear which communication is referred by these limitations.

Claim 54, recites the limitations, “the tags”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-7, 9-31, 33-49 and 51-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al., 6,615,212, IBM (Hereinafter Dutta-IBM).

9. As per claim 1, Dutta-IBM clearly teaches an apparatus (e.g., col., 5, lines 29 – 43) for intercepting data (e.g., figure 5, col., 6, lines 5 - 15) communicated between a sender and a receiver (e.g., col., 2, lines 39 – 58), and conditionally altering that data (e.g., figure 6, col., 6, lines 47 – 58), the apparatus comprising:

(a) an interception unit (e.g., figure 5, col., 6, lines 5 - 15), capable of intercepting said communication (e.g., figure 5, col., 6, lines 5 - 15),

(b) a memory (e.g., figures 2 and 3, col., 4, lines 33 - 43), for storing predetermined device settings (e.g., figure 6, col., 7, lines 44 – 62),

(c) access functionality (e.g., figure 7, col., 7, lines 56 – 67), associated with said interception unit (e.g., figure 5, col., 6, lines 5 - 15), operable to access data within said interception communication (e.g., figure 5, col., 6, lines 5 - 15), and

(d) a search and replace unit (e.g., figure 7, col., 7, lines 56 – 67), associated with both said interception unit (e.g., figure 5, col., 6, lines 5 - 15) and said access functionality (e.g.,

Art Unit: 2154

figure 7, col., 7, lines 56 – 67) being operable to conditionally alter (e.g., figure 6, col., 6, lines 47 – 58) the intercepted communication (e.g., figure 5, col., 6, lines 5 - 15) in response to said accessed data and said device settings (e.g., figure 6, col., 7, lines 44 – 54).

10. As per claim 2, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

said access functionality is operable to access information about the sender or receiver (e.g., col., 2, lines 43 – 58).

11. As per claim 3, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

said settings include data to be changed (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 12).

12. As per claim 4, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

said interception unit being connectable to intercept data from a computer network (e.g., col., 3, lines 32 – 38).

13. As per claim 5, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the sender of data and receiver of the data are respectively remotely located. (e.g., col., 3, lines 41 - 54).

14. As per claim 6, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

said computer network is a packet based network (e.g., col., 3, lines 46 - 59).

15. As per claim 7, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

said computer network is TCP/IP based network (e.g., col., 3, lines 46 - 59).

16. As per claim 9, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the interception unit being locatable on a sending computer (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 - 53).

17. As per claim 10, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to determine a structure of input data and to carry out said alteration within the framework of said determined structure (e.g., figures 6 and 7).

18. As per claim 11, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure is a text data structure (e.g., col., 5, lines 43 – 54).

19. As per claim 12, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure defines content text and tag data (e.g., col., 5, lines 43 – 54, col., 6, lines 47 - 67).

20. As per claim 13, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to do altering data found in around the text (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

21. As per claim 14, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure is XML format (e.g., col., 7, lines 55 – 67).

22. As per claim 15, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to words and altering data around that selection (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

23. As per claim 16, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

Art Unit: 2154

altering data around and in selection wherein that data consists of images (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

24. As per claim 17, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structured data is image data (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

25. As per claim 18, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the data alteration consists of altering the resolution of the data (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

26. As per claim 19, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the interception unit being locatable on a receiving computer (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 – 53, figure 9).

27. As per claim 20, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to determine a structure of input data and to carry out said alteration within the framework of said determined structure (e.g., figures 6 and 7).

Art Unit: 2154

28. As per claim 21, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure is a text data structure (e.g., col., 5, lines 43 – 54).

29. As per claim 22, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure defines content text and tag data (e.g., col., 5, lines 43 – 54, col., 6, lines 47 - 67).

30. As per claim 23, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to do altering data found in around the text (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

31. As per claim 24, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure is XML format (e.g., col., 7, lines 55 – 67).

32. As per claim 25, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to words and altering data around said selection (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

33. As per claim 26, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

altering data around and in selection wherein that data consists of images (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

34. As per claim 27, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structured data is image data (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

35. As per claim 28, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the data alteration consists of altering the resolution of the data (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

36. As per claim 29, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the interception unit being locatable on an intermediate network node, between the computer sending the data and the computer receiving the data (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 – 63, figure 9).

37. As per claim 30, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

Art Unit: 2154

said node is a gateway node (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 – 63, figure 9).

38. As per claim 31, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

said node is a proxy node (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 – 63, figure 9).

39. As per claim 33, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to determine a structure of input data and to carry out a replacement within the framework of said determined structure (e.g., figures 6 and 7).

40. As per claim 34, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure is a text data structure (e.g., col., 5, lines 43 – 54).

41. As per claim 35, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure defines content text and tag data (e.g., col., 5, lines 43 – 54, col., 6, lines 47 – 67).

Art Unit: 2154

42. As per claim 36, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to do altering data found in around the text (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

43. As per claim 37, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure is XML format (e.g., col., 7, lines 55 – 67).

44. As per claim 38, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the search and replace unit is operable to words and altering data which can be found in and around said selection (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

45. As per claim 39, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

altering data around and in selection wherein that data consists of images (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

46. As per claim 40, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structured data is image data (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

47. As per claim 41, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the data alteration consists of altering the resolution of the data (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

48. As per claim 42, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

a server on a network (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 – 53, figure 9) with functionality to intercept data being sent (e.g., figure 5, col., 6, lines 5 - 15).

49. As per claim 43, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

a data carrier carrying data usable in combination with a general purpose computer (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 – 53, figure 9).

50. As per claim 44, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

a method for intercepting communications (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 – 53) between a sender and a receiver (e.g., col., 2, lines 39 – 58).

51. As per claim 45, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

Art Unit: 2154

a method for intercepting communications (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 12, lines 32 – 39, col., 3, lines 41 – 53) between a sender and a receiver (e.g., col., 2, lines 39 – 58).

52. As per claim 46, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

intercepting a communication on a computer network (e.g., col., 3, lines 32 – 38).

53. As per claim 47, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the sender of data and receiver of the communication are respectively remotely located.
(e.g., col., 3, lines 41 - 54).

54. As per claim 48, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

intercepting a communication from a packet-switched network (e.g., col., 3, lines 46 – 59, col., 4, lines 44 - 65).

55. As per claim 49, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

said network is TCP/IP based network (e.g., col., 3, lines 46 - 59).

Art Unit: 2154

56. As per claim 51, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

detecting a data structure of altering data within in such a way as to conform to said detected structure (e.g., figures 6 and 7).

57. As per claim 52, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

altering text data (e.g., col., 5, lines 43 – 54).

58. As per claim 53, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the text data comprises content text and tag data (e.g., col., 5, lines 43 – 54, col., 6, lines 47 - 67).

59. As per claim 54, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

adding data around the text (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

60. As per claim 55, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the structure is XML format (e.g., col., 7, lines 55 – 67).

Art Unit: 2154

61. As per claim 56, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

said searching through and conditionally altering comprises finding words and carrying out altering data around said selection (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

62. As per claim 57, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

wherein the data consists of images (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

63. As per claim 58, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

altering said communication in accordance with predetermined settings (e.g., figure 6, col., 7, lines 44 – 62).

64. As per claim 59, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

altering said communication in accordance with accessed data (e.g., figures 5 and 6, col., 6, lines 5 – 15, col., 7, lines 44 – 62).

65. As per claim 60, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

altering said communication in accordance with said accessed data taken together with pre-determined settings (e.g., figures 5 and 6, col., 6, lines 5 – 15, col., 7, lines 44 – 62).

66. As per claim 61, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

wherein the structured data consists of image data (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

67. As per claim 62, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dutta-IBM also teaches the following:

the data alteration consists of altering the resolution of the data (e.g., col., 7, lines 1 – 14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

68. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

69. Claims 8, 32 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta-IBM in view of “Official Notice”.

70. As per claims 8 and 50, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dutta-IBM does not specifically mention about receiving message parts in separate packets and assembling said packets to form entire message and a message assembler operable to assemble complete messages from assorted packets. “Official Notice” is taken that both the

Art Unit: 2154

concept and advantages of providing a message assembler operable to assemble complete messages from assorted packets is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include receiving message parts in separate packets and assembling said packets to form entire message and a message assembler operable to assemble complete messages from assorted packets with the teachings of Dutta-IBM in order to facilitate assembling complete messages from assorted /separate packets because the assembling would enhance supporting information contained in the assorted / separate packets. The information would be utilized for assembling the message(s).

71. As per claim 32, Dutta-IBM teaches the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dutta-IBM does not specifically mention about ISP node. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing ISP node is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include ISP node with the teachings of Dutta-IBM in order to facilitate usage of ISP node because the ISP node would support handling information between a sender and a receiver. The receiver would utilize the information.

Conclusion

72. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2154


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

October 1, 2005

 **JOHN FOLLANSBEE**
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100